DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 764 JC 730 071

AUTHOR	Huff, Stuart; Opacinch, Cheryl
TITLE	College-Wide Participation in Policy Evaluation. Report on the Study of Attendance to the College Senate, March 20, 1972.
INSTITUTION	Catonsville Community Coll., Md.
PUB DATE	20 Mar 72
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, February 25-March 1, 1973)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attendance Patterns; *College Attendance; Community Colleges; *Educational Policy; Evaluation; Failure Factors; Grade Point Average; *Grades (Scholastic); Post Secondary Education; Success Factors; Tables (Data); Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted at Catonsville Community College to investigate the relationship between grade received and attendance during the fall 1971 semester. No attempt was made to establish a cause-effect relationship. Analyses were based upon a sample of individual grades and percentage of attendance as reported by faculty. Grades analyzed totaled 9,322 (5,525 freshman and 3,797 sophomore grades), 56% of the total number of grades. Data were analyzed for these subgroups: freshmen, sophomores, new students, returning students, transfer students, full-time, part-time, numbers of credits completed, and composite profiles. "Beyond toleration" levels were established for percentage of absences beyond which the level of absence group's mean grade was below 2.0. The data clearly establish the existence of a strong relationship between attendance and grade awarded for the population as a whole and within each group. The degree of the relationship is highest for students completing 0-10 credits. Mean QPA's for each of the other groups rise as the degree of the relationship lessens. Thirty-eight percent of all F grades in the sample occurred within the absence level that could be tolerated. Grade distribution and academic action data do not support a hypothesis that the present attendance policy has had an adverse effect upon grades or withdrawals. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073764

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLLEGE-WIDE PARTICIPATION IN POLICY EVALUATION

Dr. Stuart Huff
Academic Dean

Dr. Cheryl Opacinch
Coordinator of Institutional Research

Catonsville Community College

Report on the Study of Attendance
to the College Senate

March 20, 1972

Committee Members:
Mr. Stanley Bielak
Mr. John Masterson
Mr. Lawrence Messier
Dr. Cheryl Opacinch
Mr. Robert Reynard
Mr. Paul Terry
Dr. Robert Vargas
Dr. Stuart M. Huff, Chairman

Paper Presented at the
Annual AERA Meeting
New Orleans, Louisiana
February, 1973

JC 730 071

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 20 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

REPORT TO THE SENATE: ATTENDANCE STUDY

The primary purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between grade received and attendance during the Fall 1971 semester. Since only the two variables of grade and attendance are considered and other important variables are not, no conclusions can be made as to a cause-effect relationship. However, statistical analyses by various sub-groups on the basis of common factors do produce important facts which need to be considered in any study of the practical effects of the attendance policy.

THE SAMPLE

The analyses are based upon a sample of individual grades and percentage of attendance as reported on the forms used by faculty. The total grades reported were 9,322 and included 5,525 freshmen and 3,797 sophomore grades. This constitutes 56% of the 16,712 grades actually recorded. It is estimated that nearly 90% of the target sample are reflected in the study. The faculty are to be commended for the care and completeness with which reports were prepared. It is clear that the size and representativeness of the sample establish the study as a replication of the total population and diminishe the need to correct for error or bias.

THE DESIGN

The data of the study were treated in different ways. Printouts were produced for each course, summaries of course types, divisional summaries, grade distributions, sub-groups, and statistical data. Divisional and course printouts will be made available to divisions for their study and analysis. Other printouts have been summarized in various tables within this report and a few of the hundreds of printouts are included here to show the data base for the tables.

Analyses of the data were accomplished for these sub-groups: freshmen, sophomores, new students, returning students, transfer students, full-time, part-time, numbers of credits completed, and composite profiles. Some common factors applied to each sub-group or combinations of them are number of cases, mean, standard deviation, number and percentage in each attendance level category, adjustment by omission of those with 50% or greater absence, an arbitrary "beyond toleration level"in terms of percentage of absences beyond which the level of absence group mean grade was below 2.0, actual and reported grade distribution percentages, and Chi Square value. Although not a principal component of the study, other analyses were made, when data was available, because of the obvious relevance to the study.

GRADE DISTRIBUTION ANALYSES

An analysis of grade distributions for the fall semesters of 1969, 1970, and 1971, along with distributions reflected in the study data (Table I), adds credence to the accuracy of the study. A marked rise in the proportion of A's may be noted for the three-year period; B's, C's and D's remained relatively stable; and F's show a gradual rise. It should be pointed out that the present attendance policy and a later withdrawal date were implemented after the Fall 1969 term. The drop in withdrawal proportions is to be expected since those who now withdraw from college between the fifth and eleventh weeks do not appear as W grades. It may be observed that there has been no significant rise in the proportion of D's or F's awarded across the college since the implementation of the attendance and tenth week withdrawal policies. Of course, comparative attendance data are not available for previous semesters nor are grade data for the various sub-groups included in the study. Thus, no comparative analysis of grade distribution can be done by sub-groups.

ACADEMIC ACTION ANALYSIS

A visual study of Table XII, comparing academic actions of only fall semesters for the last three years, suggests that there has been no detrimental effect consequent to the implementation of the present attendance and withdrawal policies. On the contrary, there has been a consistent decrease in negative academic actions during the three fall semesters and an increase in positive academic actions. Although not shown on the table, negative academic actions tend to be slightly greater in spring semesters than in fall semesters. Since this study focuses upon fall semesters, and since fall and spring semesters are often viewed as having basic differences, no spring data are included.

THE MESSIER STUDY ON WITHDRAWALS

The "Study on Absence and Its Effects on Withdrawing Students, Fall Semester 1971-72," by Lawrence Messier, March 9, 1972, provides additional information concerning absence and performance. (See Appendix A)* The study involved those students who officially withdrew from college.

The study concludes that in 62% of the responses, withdrawing students did not consider their absences from class as a factor in the decision to withdraw. Only 10% of the students indicated poor academic achievement as their chief reason for withdrawal. About one-half of this group had absences fewer than 50% at the time of their withdrawal. Yet, only 8% of those who listed poor academic achievement as a reason for withdrawal also listed absence as the only major reason for withdrawal. The data suggest that absence in these cases may only be a visible manifestation of a more basic reason for withdrawal. The study also indicates that the absence rates do not vary greatly between those who gave poor achievement as a reason and those who gave other reasons. Although numerous absences may be present in nearly half of the withdrawal cases, the data do not support a conclusion which could assign absence as a cause of failure.

* Appendix A not included in this report.

GRADE-ATTENDANCE ANALYSES

Tables II-VI represent summaries of base data for various sub-groups. The tables include statistical analyses and an adjustment of the sample data accomplished by removing all grades in the 50% or more absence level. This adjustment technique is employed to compensate for the sharp skewing of F's and the paucity of other grades, both of which render correlational measures impractical. Because there were too few cases in the absence level categories to give confidence to the reliability of the statistical analyses, it was necessary to collapse the tables.

Further, the study cannot determine whether or not the F's were awarded consequent to discontinuance in attendance and failure to withdraw or for unsatisfactory achievement on work attempted and evaluated. The assumption underlying the adjustment is that most of the "50% or more" absence group of F grades were "unofficial withdrawals."

For comparative purposes, each table is divided into an "OK level" and a "beyond toleration level." The beyond toleration level occurs at that point on the "percent absent" scale (See Tables VIII-XI) when the attendance group grade mean drops below 2.0. This point is established in order to compare various subgroups in terms of the relationship between percent of absences and the mean grade for the group. For example, on the "Freshmen Part-time" data shown on Table II, χ^2 for C grades is .00. This indicates that the number of C's obtained is virtually what was expected were there no difference in the distribution of absences for students earning various grades. (For a more detailed explanation of χ^2, see Appendix B).* A quick glance at the χ^2 values of the C grades of all freshmen point up extremely low χ^2 figures, particularly in relation to other χ^2 values. Thus, one could conclude that there is no real difference among freshmen who earn C grades and who have different percentages of absence. Put more simply, there is no relationship established between Freshman C grades and absence. (The same holds true for all other sub-group C grades, with the single exception of students who have not yet completed ten credit hours of study.)

* Appendix B not included in this report.

GRADE-ATTENDANCE ANALYSES (CONT.)

Table II describes the relationship between grades received and level of absence for freshmen; adjusted data were used. The tolerated level of absences is greater for full-time freshmen than for part-time freshmen (20% as compared to 15%). Table XIII also shows that full-time freshmen have a mean QPA of 2.33, whereas part-time freshmen have a mean QPA of 1.98. Thus, not only can full-time freshmen tolerate more absences but also earn higher grades. This may well be a function of ability. Students who enter with background deficiencies and restricted loads are included in the part-time freshmen grouping. It may be assumed that a large portion of the students with deficient backgrounds are included in the 0-10 credits completed grouping (Table IV). Their absence toleration level is only 10% and of this group 65% exceed the toleration level. It may well be this group which is lowering the part-time freshmen absence level. This fact suggests that this group may warrant special attention and that part-time freshmen data must be viewed with this group in mind.

The percentage of full-time freshmen missing more than the tolerated level of absences is 26%, part-time freshmen 46%, and 0-10 credits completed 65%. These differing percentages and differing levels of tolerated absences must be considered in any proposed attendance requirements.

The χ^2 values for full-time, part-time, 0-10 credits completed and all freshmen are significant beyond the .001 level. There is a significant relationship between grades and level of absences for each of these sub-groups.

For full-time, part-time, and all freshmen groups, the A and F grades show the most deviance from the absence level which would be expected if there were no relationship between grades and level of absences. Simply stated, A students tend to miss less than expected and F students tend to miss more than expected.

The correlation coefficients between grades and level of absences are approximately the same for full-time freshmen (.40), part-time freshmen (.41), and all freshmen (.41). It is necessary to recall that part-time freshmen have a lower tolerated level of absences and a lower QPA in interpreting the correlations. The correlation for all students (.38) is less than the freshmen sub-groups correlations suggesting that there is a stronger relationship between grades received and level of absences for the freshmen sub-groups than for all students.

Sophomores

Sophomores sub-group data are presented in Table III and XIII. Full-time and part-time sophomores have a toleration level of 35% absences; all sophomores have a toleration level of 40% absences. Throughout the sophomore sub-groups and total, only 7% have absences in excess of the toleration level. The mean QPA of the sophomore sub-groups is 2.63-2.64; however, the standard deviation for full-time sophomores is .88 as contrasted to 1.074 for part-time sophomores. This indicates that there is less variability in the grades earned by full-time sophomores than part-time sophomores. The total sophomores mean QPA is 2.64; the total freshmen mean QPA is 2.24. The percentage of grades reported in the tolerated absence levels also differs greatly. Within the tolerated absence level, the proportion for sophomores is 93%, for all freshmen 72%, and for part-time freshmen 54%. There may be a "weeding out" process occurring which yields a sophomore with higher ability and a higher level of absences which can be tolerated.

The χ^2 values for each of the Sophomore sub-groups and total are significant beyond the .001 level. The major portion of the χ^2 value for each of the sub-groups is contributed by the level of absences in the F grades column. As for the freshmen, fewer F students fall within the tolerated absence level, and more F students fall beyond the tolerated absence level than would be expected if there were no relationship between grades and attendance. Unlike the Freshmen students, the second most important factor contributing to the χ^2 value is the distribution of absences for B grades. More B grades fall within the tolerated absence level and fewer B grades fall beyond the tolerated absence level than would be expected.

The correlation coefficients for the sophomore sub-groups show a wider variation than for freshmen. The relationship between grades received and level of absences is .29 for full-time sophomores, .38 for part-time sophomores, and .30 for all sophomores. Because the level of tolerated absences is the same for both full-time and part-time sophomores, the differences in the correlations clearly point out that there exists a stronger relationship between grades and attendance for part-time sophomores than full-time.

The sophomore correlations are nearly .10 smaller than freshmen correlations and the tolerated absence level is more than 20% higher.

The absence-grade profile for new students (Table V) is virtually the same as for freshmen. The absence toleration level is the same (0-20%) and the correlation (.41) is within the range of correlations of all freshmen sub-groups. Thus, conclusions which hold true for freshmen will also apply to this sub-group.

There is less assurance that the degree of relation between attendance and grades for returning students (Table V) is as high as that for freshmen or new students (correlation coefficient = .36). However, the toleration level (0-25%) is greater for this group. The χ^2 values demonstrate, nonetheless, that there is a significant relationship between level of attendance and grades particularly in the F group.

The transfer student profile (Table V) reveals the least degree of relationship between attendance and grades of any group. The absence toleration level is quite high (0-40%). The sample is small the distribution fairly even and as expected, and the χ^2 value is lower than that for any sub-group. Were it not for the F grades distribution of absences, there would undoubtedly not be a significant χ^2 or correlation between grades and attendance for transfer students. Thus, there is little basis to conclude that absence and grades are dependent variables for transfer students as a group. A simplified interpretation is that transfer students seem to out-perform all other groups in spite of a higher absence toleration level. The mean QPA of all transfer students (Table XIII) is 2.85, which is much higher than any other sub-group.

COMPOSITE

The relationship between grades and level of absence for all students in the study appears as Table VI. Overall, there is a toleration level of absences of 25%, and 82% of the grades reported fall within this level. The χ^2 value was significant, indicating there is a relationship between grades and absence level. The major contributions to the χ^2 value came from the absence distribution of A and F grades. Far fewer A grades appeared beyond the tolerated absence level, and far more F grades than would be expected if there were no relationship between grades and attendance. The resultant correlation for all students was .39.

A comparison of selected sub-group and composite data is presented in Table XIII. In brief summary, the mean QPA was highest for transfer students and lowest for students having earned 0-10 credits. The highest percentage of tolerated absences was for part-time freshmen (15%) and students receiving 0-10 credits (10%). The highest percentage of passing grades (A-D) in the grade distribution beyond the tolerated absence level was achieved by full-time sophomores (82%); the lowest percentage was achieved by students earning 0-10 credits (60%). Grade distributions within the tolerated absence level also varied. The highest percentage of failures in the grade distribution at the tolerated absence level was 8% for students earning 0-10 credits and the lowest percentage of failures for full-time and all sophomores, 2%. Thus,

although one may establish a point of toleration for absences, failing grades may be received when absences fall within that point and passing grades may be received when absences exceed that point. If one wished to hypothetically assume that attendance and grades were causative, that attendance within a tolerated level would be mandated, one might wish to know the percentage of the sample who could maximally be affected. The last row of information in Table XIII summarizes this data. It lists the percentage of the sample receiving failing grades and having absences in excess of the tolerated level. The lowest percentages are achieved by full-time sophomores (1.3%), all sophomores and transfer students (1.5%); the highest percentages are achieved by students earning 0-10 credits (26%), and part-time freshmen (16%).

The variations in the sub-group data, notably mean QPA, level of tolerated absences, and percentage of grades falling within that level, have been treated in previous analyses of sub-group data.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study does not attempt to establish a cause-effect relationship between absence and attendance. It does, however, clearly establish the existence of a strong relationship between attendance and grade awarded for the population as a whole and within each group.

The data demonstrate that the degree of the relationship is highest for students completing 0-10 credits. Other groups, in descending order, are part-time freshmen, full-time freshmen, new students, returning students, part-time sophomores, full-time sophomores, and transfer students. Mean QPA's for each of the groups follow the same pattern but in ascending order. The highest percentages of absence tolerated before the absence group mean QPA falls below the 2.0 level are also in the same ascending order. It must be pointed out that 38% of all F grades included in the adjusted sample occured within the absence level which could be tolerated. 9% of all F grades for the 0-10 credit group occurred within the tolerable (10%) level, 20% of part-time freshmen, 66% of transfer students, 60% of full-time sophomores. All of these data, of course, challenge the wisdom of assigning absence as a cause of performance.

Grade distribution and academic action data do not support a hypothesis that the present attendance policy has had an adverse effect upon grades or withdrawals. The Messier study reinforces and supports this conclusion.

Included in Appendix C is a tabulation of comments relating to the attendance policy made by faculty as a part of the 1971 Administrative Survey. Many of these comments raise issues which are not spoken to in this study. For example, the study does not deal with any relationship between student attendance and teaching effectiveness, increased workload, faculty morale, teaching approach, or other interpersonal relationships. These are important, but separate considerations which must be dealt with in a different context.

TABLE I: Grade Distributions in Percentages - Fall 1969, 1970 and 1971

Data Source	Reporting Period	Grades Received						
		A	B	C	D	F	W	INC.
CCC Grade Distribution Report	Fall 1969	14.6	29.6	32.1	8.6	9.9	4.5	.9
CCC Grade Distribution Report	Fall 1970	16.4	29.7	31.0	8.1	11.5	2.2	1.1
CCC Grade Distribution Report	Fall 1971	19.5	29.8	27.1	7.0	12.2	2.2	2.2
CCC Attendance Study - Unadjusted Data	Fall 1971	16.9	29.4	30.9	8.7	13.8	NA	NA
CCC Attendance Study - Adjusted Data [1]	Fall 1971	18.0	31.0	33.0	9.0	9.0	NA	NA

[1]Adjusted Data: Excludes grades received by students with reported absences in excess of 50%.

TABLE II

FRESHMEN - Full-time, Part-Time, and Total

Chi Square: The Relationship Between Grades Received and Level of Absences (Adjusted Data)

Freshmen Full-Time

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Total	Percentage of Sample
0-20%	fo	517	889	886	178	88	2558	74%
OK	fe	415.54	772.24	877.24	234.58	258.41	2558	
	χ^2	24.78	17.65	.09	13.65	112.37	168.54	
21%-50%	fo	41	148	292	137	259	877	26%
Beyond Toleration	fe	142.46	264.76	300.76	80.42	88.59	877	
	χ^2	72.26	51.49	.26	39.80	327.77	491.58	
Totals		558	1037	1178	315	347	3435	

χ^2 = 660.1178, significant beyond the .001 level

Freshmen Part-Time

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Total	Percentage of Sample
0-15%	fo	145	202	186	58	46	637	54%
OK	fe	92.46	144.60	186.53	87.62	125.79	637	
	χ^2	29.86	22.78	.00	10.01	50.61	113.27	
16%-50%	fo	27	67	161	105	188	548	46%
Beyond Toleration	fe	79.54	124.40	160.47	75.38	108.21	548	
	χ^2	34.71	26.48	.00	11.64	58.83	131.66	
Totals		172	269	347	163	234	1185	

χ^2 = 244.9256, significant beyond the .001 level

All Freshmen

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Total	Percentage of Sample
0-20%	fo	675	1116	1120	258	151	3320	72%
OK	fe	524.59	938.51	1095.89	343.50	417.52	3320	
	χ^2	43.13	33.57	.53	21.28	170.13	268.63	
21%-50%	fo	55	190	405	220	430	1300	28%
Beyond Toleration	fe	205.41	367.49	429.11	134.50	163.48	1300	
	χ^2	110.14	85.72	1.35	54.35	434.48	686.04	
Totals		730	1306	1525	478	581	4620	

χ^2 = 954.6702, significant beyond the .001 level

TABLE III

Sophomores: Full-time, Part-time and Total

Chi Square: The Relationship Between Grades Received and Level of Absences (Adjusted Data)

Sophomores Full-Time

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Totals	Percentage of Sample
0-35%	fo	567	987	852	149	55	2610	93%
OK	fe	542.08	947.48	859.15	176.67	84.61	2610	
	χ^2	1.15	1.65	.06	4.33	10.36	17.55	
36%-50%	fo	16	32	72	41	36	197	7%
Beyond Toleration	fe	40.96	71.52	64.85	13.33	6.39	197	
	χ^2	15.17	21.83	.79	57.40	137.31	232.51	
Totals		583	1019	924	190	91	2807	

χ^2 = 250.0571, significant beyond the .001 level

Sophomores Part-Time

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Totals	Percentage of Sample
0-35%	fo	155	216	182	43	16	612	93%
OK	fe	146.25	204.00	184.44	48.44	28.88	612	
	χ^2	.52	.71	.03	.61	5.74	7.61	
36%-50%	fo	2	3	16	9	15	45	7%
Beyond Toleration	fe	10.75	15.00	13.56	3.56	2.12	45	
	χ^2	7.13	9.60	.44	8.30	78.18	103.56	
Totals		157	219	198	52	31	657	

χ^2 = 111.1774, significant beyond the .001 level

All Sophomores

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Totals	Percentage of Sample
0-40%	fo	722	1203	1034	192	71	3222	93%
OK	fe	688.30	1151.51	1043.62	225.09	113.48	3222	
	χ^2	1.65	2.30	.09	4.87	15.90	24.81	
41% 50%	fo	18	35	88	50	51	242	7%
Beyond Toleration	fe	51.70	86.49	78.38	16.91	8.52	242	
	χ^2	21.96	30.65	1.18	64.78	211.70	330.27	
Totals		740	1238	1122	242	122	3464	

χ^2 = 355.0785, significant beyond the .001 level

TABLE IV

STUDENTS COMPLETING 0 - 10 CREDITS

Chi Square: The Relationship Between Grades Received and Level of Absence (Adjusted Data)

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Total	Percentage of Sample
0-10%	fo	78	142	178	54 -	38 -	490	35%
OK	fe	40.78	83.99	156.13	67.61	141.49	490	
	χ^2	33.98	40.07	3.06	2.74	75.70	155.55	
11-50%	fo	39	99	270	140 +	368 +	916	65%
Beyond Toleration	fe	76.22	157.01	291.87	126.39	264.51	916	
	χ^2	18.18	21.43	1.64	1.47	40.49	83.21	
Totals		117	241	448	194	406	1406	

χ^2=238.7611, significant beyond the .001 level

TABLE V

New, Returning and Transfer

Chi Square: The Relationship Between Grades Received and Level of Absences

New Students

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Totals	Percentage of Sample
0-20%	fo	448	819	907	209	98	2481	82%
OK	fe	358.86	695.57	883.12	259.91	283.54	2481	
	χ^2	22.14	21.90	.65	9.97	121.41	176.08	
21%-50%	fo	38	123	289	143	286	879	18%
Beyond Toleration	fe	127.14	246.43	312.88	92.09	100.46	879	
	χ^2	62.50	61.83	1.82	28.15	342.70	496.99	
Totals		486	942	1196	352	384	3360	

χ^2 = 673.0731, significant beyond the .001 level

Returning Students

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Totals	Percentage of Sample
0-25%	fo	790	1300	1076	223	112	3501	82%
OK	fe	682.12	1187.55	1104.54	281.89	244.91	3501	
	χ^2	17.06	10.65	.74	12.30	72.13	112.87	
26%-50%	fo	40	145	268	120	186	759	18%
Beyond Toleration	fe	147.88	257.45	239.46	61.11	53.09	759	
	χ^2	78.70	49.12	3.40	56.75	332.69	520.66	
Totals		830	1445	1344	343	298	4260	

χ^2 = 633.5306, significant beyond the .001 level

Transfer Students[1]

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Totals	Percentage of Sample
0-40%	fo	152	153	102	21	14	442	95%
OK	fe	146.70	149.56	101.93	23.81	20.00	442	
	χ^2	.19	.08	.00	.33	1.80	2.41	
41%-50%	fo	2	4	5	4	7	22	5%
Beyond Toleration	fe	7.30	7.44	5.07	1.19	1	22	
	χ^2	3.85	1.59	.01	6.68	36.21	48.35	
Totals		154	157	107	25	21	464	

[1] Uncorrected χ^2

χ^2 = 50.7588, significant beyond the .001 level

TABLE VI

Composite: All Students

Chi Square: The Relationship Between Grades Received and Level of Absences (Adjusted Data)

Level of Absences		Grades Received A	B	C	D	F	Total	Percentage of Sample
0-25%	fo	1403	2323	2203	487 -	264 -	6680	82%
	fe	1214.70	2102.17	2187.28	594.95	580.91	6680	
OK	X^2	29.19	23.20	.11	19.59	172.88	244.97	
26%-50%	fo	67	221	444	233 +	439 +	1404	18%
Beyond Toleration	fe	255.30	441.83	459.72	125.05	122.09	1404	
	X^2	138.89	110.37	.54	93.20	822.55	1165.55	
Totals		1470	2544	2647	720	703	8084	

X^2 = 1410.5212, significant beyond the .001 level

TABLE VII

Comparison of Chi Square by Sub-groups, Adjusted and Unadjusted Data

	ADJUSTED	UNADJUSTED[1]
Freshmen		
Full-time	660.1178	1368.94
Part-time	244.9256	441.41
Total	954.6702	2760.28
Sophomores		
Full-time	250.0571	1014.15
Part-time	111.1774	358.53
Total	355.0785	1390.11
Students		
0-10 credits completed	238.7611	1016.10
New	673.0731	1932.75
Returning	633.5306	2050.14
Transfer	50.7588[2]	378.35
Composite Total	1410.5212	4227.18

[1] Because no correction factor was employed to compensate for cells with lower frequencies than that required by χ^2 in the Unadjusted Data, those χ^2 must be viewed with extreme caution as they cannot be presumed to be reliable.

[2] Uncorrected χ^2 value.

TABLE VIII

CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ATTENDANCE EVALUATION STUDY

PERIOD BREAKDOWN REPORT FOR
FINAL COMPOSITE REPORT

POPULATION MEDIAN - 2.384

FALL, 1971
PAGE 00009

PERCENT ABSENT	FINAL GRADES REPORTED A		B		C		D		F		TOTAL STDTS GRADED	A - F AVG	STAND DEV	NUMBER ABOVE/BELOW MEDIAN		TOTAL STDTS N,I,S,U	PERCENT GRAND TOTALS
0 - 5	631	29.2	794	36.8	619	28.7	87	4.0	25	1.1	2156	2.89	.913	1497	659	200	2356
6 - 10	425	22.5	690	36.5	592	31.3	128	6.7	53	2.8	1888	2.69	.985	1184	704	63	1951
TOTAL	1056	26.1	1484	36.6	1211	29.9	215	5.3	78	1.9	4044	2.79	.953	2680	1364	263	4307
11 - 15	160	15.9	368	36.7	345	34.4	77	7.6	51	5.0	1001	2.50	1.015	568	433	32	1033
TOTAL	1216	24.1	1852	36.7	1556	30.8	292	5.7	129	2.5	5045	2.74	.972	3248	1797	295	5340
16 - 20	124	13.8	265	29.5	358	39.8	91	10.1	60	6.6	898	2.33	1.051	431	467	34	932
TOTAL	1340	22.5	2117	35.6	1914	32.2	383	6.4	189	3.1	5943	2.67	.994	3679	2264	329	6272
21 - 25	63	8.5	206	27.9	289	39.2	104	14.1	75	10.1	737	2.10	1.077	303	434	35	772
TOTAL	1403	21.0	2323	34.7	2203	32.9	487	7.2	264	3.9	6680	2.61	1.021	3982	2698	364	7044
26 - 30	18	5.0	83	23.4	132	37.2	57	16.1	64	18.0	354	1.81	1.135	116	238	26	380
TOTAL	1421	20.2	2406	34.2	2335	33.1	544	7.7	328	4.6	7034	2.57	1.042	4098	2936	390	7424
31 - 35	23	5.9	78	20.1	129	33.2	58	14.9	100	25.7	388	1.65	1.225	116	272	23	411
TOTAL	1444	19.4	2484	33.4	2464	33.1	602	8.1	428	5.7	7422	2.52	1.071	4214	3208	413	7835
36 - 40	12	4.6	26	10.0	95	36.6	54	20.8	72	27.7	259	1.42	1.131	49	210	32	291
TOTAL	1456	18.9	2510	32.6	2559	33.3	656	8.5	500	6.5	7681	2.49	1.091	4263	3418	445	8126
41 - 45	7	2.8	25	10.1	64	25.9	48	19.4	103	41.7	247	1.12	1.149	39	208	34	281
TOTAL	1463	18.4	2535	31.9	2623	33.0	704	8.8	603	7.6	7928	2.44	1.120	4302	3626	479	8407
46 - 50	7	4.4	9	5.7	24	15.3	16	10.2	100	64.1	156	.76	1.172	19	137	22	178
TOTAL	1470	18.1	2544	31.4	2647	32.7	720	8.9	703	8.6	8084	2.41	1.143	4321	3763	501	8585
OVER 50	6	.9	27	4.2	54	8.4	40	6.2	509	80.0	636	.39	.882	39	597	101	737
T O T A L	1476	16.9	2571	29.4	2701	30.9	760	8.7	1212	13.8	8720	2.26	1.242	4360	4360	602	9322

TOLERATION LEVEL

TABLE IX

CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ATTENDANCE EVALUATION STUDY

CREDITS TO DATE REPORT FOR ZERO TO 10 CREDITS TO DATE

POPULATION MEDIAN - 1.169

FALL, 1971

PERCENT ABSENT	FINAL GRADES REPORTED A	B	C	D	F	TOTAL STDTS GRADED	A - F AVG	STAND DEV	NUMBER ABOVE/BELOW MEDIAN		TOTAL STDTS W,I,S,U	PERCENT GRAND TOTALS
0 - 5	42 16.9	87 35.0	81 32.6	29 11.6	9 3.6	248	2.50	1.019	220	28	49	297
6 - 10	36 14.8	55 22.7	97 40.0	25 10.3	29 11.9	242	2.18	1.173	196	46	19	261
TOTAL	78 15.9	142 28.9	178 36.3	54 11.0	38 7.7	490	2.34	1.110	416	74	68	558
11 - 15	15 8.5	35 19.8	77 43.7	19 10.7	30 17.0	176	1.92	1.151	133	43	16	192
TOTAL	93 13.9	177 26.5	255 38.2	73 10.9	68 10.2	666	2.23	1.135	549	117	84	750
16 - 20	13 8.0	24 14.8	70 43.2	29 17.9	26 16.0	162	1.80	1.120	117	45	18	180
TOTAL	106 12.8	201 24.2	325 39.2	102 12.3	94 11.3	828	2.14	1.145	666	162	102	930
21 - 25	7 4.4	22 14.1	51 32.6	28 17.9	48 30.7	156	1.43	1.189	89	67	18	174
TOTAL	113 11.4	223 22.6	376 38.2	130 13.2	142 14.4	984	2.03	1.181	755	229	120	1104
26 - 30	2 2.0	9 9.1	25 25.5	21 21.4	41 41.8	98	1.08	1.104	43	55	15	113
TOTAL	115 10.6	232 21.4	401 37.0	151 13.9	183 16.9	1082	1.94	1.205	798	284	135	1217
31 - 35		4 3.6	25 22.7	18 16.3	63 57.2	110	.72	.933	35	75	15	125
TOTAL	115 9.6	236 19.7	426 35.7	169 14.1	246 20.6	1192	1.83	1.239	833	359	150	1342
36 - 40	2 3.0	2 3.0	13 19.6	10 15.1	39 59.0	66	.75	1.060	20	46	19	85
TOTAL	117 9.3	238 18.9	439 34.8	179 14.2	285 22.6	1258	1.77	1.250	853	405	169	1427
41 - 45		3 3.6	7 8.5	11 13.4	61 74.3	82	.41	.796	14	68	24	106
TOTAL	117 8.7	241 17.9	446 33.2	190 14.1	346 25.8	1340	1.69	1.269	867	473	193	1533
46 - 50			2 3.0	4 6.0	60 90.9	66	.12	.409	3	63	12	78
TOTAL	117 8.3	241 17.1	448 31.8	194 13.7	406 28.8	1406	1.62	1.287	870	536	205	1611
OVER 50	1 .2	2 .5	6 1.6	7 1.9	341 95.5	357	.08	.419	11	346	67	424
T O T A L	118 6.6	243 13.7	454 25.7	201 11.4	747 42.3	1763	1.31	1.318	882	881	272	2035

TOLERATION LEVEL

TABLE X

CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ATTENDANCE EVALUATION STUDY

FRESHMAN - SOPHOMORE REPORT
COVERING ALL FRESMEN

POPULATION MEDIAN - 2.178

FALL, 1971

PERCENT ABSENT	FINAL GRADES REPORTED A		B		C		D		F		TOTAL STDTS GRADED	A - F AVG	STAND DEV	NUMBER ABOVE MEDIAN	NUMBER BELOW MEDIAN	TOTAL STDTS N,I,S,U	PERCENT GRAND TOTALS
0 - 5	333	27.8	436	36.5	356	29.8	53	4.4	16	1.3	1194	2.85	.926	884	310	110	1304
6 - 10	197	19.2	360	35.0	338	32.9	86	8.3	45	4.3	1026	2.56	1.031	666	360	37	1063
TOTAL	530	23.8	796	35.8	694	31.2	139	6.2	61	2.7	2220	2.71	.986	1549	671	147	2367
11 - 15	81	14.5	177	31.7	204	36.6	52	9.3	43	7.7	557	2.36	1.084	324	233	21	578
TOTAL	611	22.0	973	35.0	898	32.3	191	6.8	104	3.7	2777	2.64	1.017	1873	904	168	2945
16 - 20	64	11.7	143	26.3	222	40.8	67	12.3	47	8.6	543	2.20	1.080	278	265	29	572
TOTAL	675	20.3	1116	33.6	1120	33.7	258	7.7	151	4.5	3320	2.57	1.039	2152	1168	197	3517
21 - 25	29	6.6	95	21.8	173	39.7	70	16.0	68	15.6	435	1.87	1.121	180	255	29	464
TOTAL	704	18.7	1211	32.2	1293	34.4	328	8.7	219	5.8	3755	2.49	1.073	2331	1424	226	3981
26 - 30	7	3.3	39	18.7	70	33.6	41	19.7	51	24.5	208	1.56	1.146	69	139	19	227
TOTAL	711	17.9	1250	31.5	1363	34.3	369	9.3	270	6.8	3963	2.44	1.097	2400	1563	245	4208
31 - 35	11	4.6	31	13.0	67	28.2	41	17.2	87	36.7	237	1.31	1.221	64	173	20	257
TOTAL	722	17.1	1281	30.5	1430	34.0	410	9.7	357	8.5	4200	2.38	1.134	2463	1737	265	4465
36 - 40	3	1.8	11	6.9	54	34.1	32	20.2	58	36.7	158	1.17	1.063	31	127	25	183
TOTAL	725	16.6	1292	29.6	1484	34.0	442	10.1	415	9.5	4358	2.33	1.154	2495	1863	290	4648
41 - 45	2	1.2	11	6.9	33	20.7	28	17.6	85	53.4	159	.84	1.053	24	135	29	188
TOTAL	727	16.0	1303	28.8	1517	33.5	470	10.4	500	11.0	4517	2.28	1.184	2518	1999	319	4836
46 - 50	3	2.9	3	2.9	8	7.7	8	7.7	81	78.6	103	.43	.962	9	94	20	123
TOTAL	730	15.8	1306	28.2	1525	33.0	478	10.3	581	12.5	4620	2.24	1.210	2527	2093	339	4959
OVER 50	1	.2	13	2.7	27	5.6	22	4.5	416	86.8	479	.24	.698	23	456	87	566
T O T A L	731	14.3	1319	25.8	1552	30.4	500	9.8	997	19.5	5099	2.05	1.307	2550	2549	426	5525

TOLERATION LEVEL

TABLE XI

CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ATTENDANCE EVALUATION STUDY

FRESHMAN - SOPHOMORE REPORT
COVERING ALL SOPHOMORES

POPULATION MEDIAN - 2.648

FALL, 1971
PAGE 00034

PERCENT ABSENT	FINAL GRADES REPORTED A		B		C		D		F		TOTAL STDTS GRADED	A - F AVG	STAND DEV	NUMBER ABOVE/BELOW MEDIAN		TOTAL STDTS N,I,S,U	PERCENT GRAND TOTALS
0 - 5	298	30.9	358	37.2	263	27.3	34	3.5	9	.9	962	2.93	.899	603	359	90	1052
6 - 10	228	26.4	330	38.2	254	29.4	42	4.8	8	.9	862	2.84	.903	509	353	26	888
TOTAL	526	28.8	688	37.7	517	28.3	76	4.1	17	.9	1824	2.89	.902	1112	712	116	1940
11 - 15	79	17.7	191	43.0	141	31.7	25	5.6	8	1.8	444	2.69	.890	242	202	11	455
TOTAL	605	26.6	879	38.7	658	29.0	101	4.4	25	1.1	2268	2.85	.903	1354	914	127	2395
16 - 20	60	16.9	122	34.3	136	38.3	24	6.7	13	3.6	355	2.54	.972	164	191	5	360
TOTAL	665	25.3	1001	38.1	794	30.2	125	4.7	38	1.4	2623	2.81	.917	1518	1105	132	2755
21 - 25	34	11.2	111	36.7	116	38.4	34	11.2	7	2.3	302	2.43	.916	129	173	6	308
TOTAL	699	23.8	1112	38.0	910	31.1	159	5.4	45	1.5	2925	2.77	.927	1646	1279	138	3063
26 - 30	11	7.5	44	30.1	62	42.4	16	10.9	13	8.9	146	2.16	1.021	48	98	7	153
TOTAL	710	23.1	1156	37.6	972	31.6	175	5.6	58	1.8	3071	2.74	.938	1695	1376	145	3216
31 - 35	12	7.9	47	31.1	62	41.0	17	11.2	13	8.6	151	2.18	1.026	52	99	3	154
TOTAL	722	22.4	1203	37.3	1034	32.0	192	5.9	71	2.2	3222	2.71	.952	1747	1475	148	3370
36 - 40	9	8.9	15	14.8	41	40.5	22	21.7	14	13.8	101	1.83	1.118	22	79	7	108
TOTAL	731	21.9	1218	36.6	1075	32.3	214	6.4	85	2.5	3323	2.69	.969	1769	1554	155	3478
41 - 45	5	5.6	14	15.9	31	35.2	20	22.7	18	20.4	88	1.63	1.140	17	71	5	93
TOTAL	736	21.5	1232	36.1	1106	32.4	234	6.8	103	3.0	3411	2.66	.988	1786	1625	160	3571
46 - 50	4	7.5	6	11.3	16	30.1	8	15.0	19	35.8	53	1.39	1.279	9	44	2	55
TOTAL	740	21.3	1238	35.7	1122	32.3	242	6.9	122	3.5	3464	2.64	1.004	1795	1669	162	3626
OVER 50	5	3.1	14	8.9	27	17.1	18	11.4	93	59.2	157	.85	1.177	17	140	14	171
T O T A L	745	20.5	1252	34.5	1149	31.7	260	7.1	215	5.9	3621	2.56	1.077	1812	1809	176	3797

TOLERATION LEVEL

TABLE XII

ACADEMIC ACTIONS*

FALL 1969, 1970, 1971

(Percentages of Total Students)

SEMESTER	PLACED ON PROBATION	LESS THAN 1.0 & 50% F	SUSPENSION	DEAN'S LIST	ENROLLMENT
Fall 1969	5.3	1.8	3.5	8.8	4587
Fall 1970	3.6	1.3	3.1	10.3	5581
Fall 1971	3.2	1.2	3.0	13.3	6199

* Based upon report of 3/15/72 of Records Office.

TABLE XIII

SUMMARY OF SUB-GROUPS

Adjusted Data (excludes grades received for students whose reported absences were in excess of 50%).

		Freshmen			Sophomores			New	Returning	Transfer	0-10 Credit Received	Composite
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
Adjusted Sample Size: Number of Cases Included		3435	1185	4620	2807	657	3464	3360	4260	464	1406	8084
Number of Cases Excluded		262	217	479	112	45	157	278	315	43	357	636
Q.P.A. $\bar{X}$		2.33	1.98	2.24	2.64	2.63	2.64	2.23	2.50	2.85	1.62	2.41
Standard Deviation		1.156	1.318	1.210	.88	1.074	1.004	1.169	1.105	1.081	1.287	1.143
Highest Percentage of Absences Tolerated before row $\bar{X}$ Q.P.A. drops below 2.0 (OK Level)		20	15	20	35	35	35	20	25	40	10	25
Percentage of Reported Grades within Tolerated Absence Level (Ok Level)		74	54	72	93	93	93	82	82	95	35	83
Percentage of A,B,C,D,F, grades Beyond Tolerated Absence Level (ie, % = A grades Beyond Tolerated Absence Level / Total A Grades)	A	7	16	8	3	1	2	8	5	1	33	5
	B	14	25	15	3	1	3	13	10	3	41	9
	C	25	46	27	8	8	8	24	20	5	60	17
	D	43	64	46	22	17	21	41	35	16	72	32
	F	75	80	74	40	48	42	74	62	33	91	62
Grade Distribution Beyond Tolerated Absence Level	A	5	5	4	8	4	7	4	5	9	4	5
	B	17	12	15	16	7	14	14	19	18	11	16
	C	33	29	31	37	36	36	33	35	23	29	32
	D	16	14	17	21	20	21	16	16	18	15	17
	F	30	20	33	18	33	21	33	25	32	40	31
Grade Distribution Within Tolerated Absence Level (OK Level)	A	20	23	20	22	25	22	18	23	34	16	21
	B	35	32	34	38	35	37	33	37	35	30	35
	C	35	29	34	33	30	32	37	31	23	36	33
	D	7	9	8	6	7	6	8	6	5	11	7
	F	3	7	4	2	3	2	4	3	3	8	4
Grade Distribution Overall	A	16	15	16	21	24	21	14	19	33	8	18
	B	30	23	28	36	33	36	28	34	34	17	31
	C	34	29	33	33	30	32	36	32	23	32	33
	D	9	14	10	7	8	7	10	8	5	14	9
	F	10	20	18	3	5	4	11	7	5	29	9
Overall Percentage of F's Beyond Tolerated Absence Level		7.5	16	9	1.3	2.3	1.5	8.5	4	1.5	26	5.4

APPENDIX C

COMMENTS ON CLASS ATTENDANCE POLICY IN ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY
1971

PRO

The most effective way to teach responsibility is to give responsibility.

The policy does help develop in the student the responsibility for his own actions; this is of educational value in itself - part of the maturing process.

A student soon comes to realize under an open policy that he is, indeed, responsible for the consequences of his own actions.

Students should be treated as adults.

Students are adults - 40% are over age 25.

Students facing up to responsibility enhances the maturing process.

Students should be given the opportunity to choose and learn responsibility for their choices.

Those who can learn without attending are not forced to attend.

CON

Students fail to understand their responsibility.

Students fail to accept their responsibility.

"Open Cut" encourages irresponsible behavior.

We as teachers are abdicating our duty to require conformance to rules and goals and to make students responsible for their own actions.

Gives the student a way to escape from something requiring mental discipline.

Most students who miss a lot do not engage in private, personal study.

There are no mature, responsible students here.

Students lack maturity to evaluate when they should attend.

Only will work on the graduate level.

First-semester freshmen need punitive measures.

Those who come from highly controlled high school atmospheres cannot adapt to an open system.

Lack of specific "guideline" is detrimental.

Does not impress upon the student the realities of life in the outside world.

Those who miss frequently do not "hear" the assignments the way they need to in order to understand the full expectation.

Most students need to attend so that exposure to material is facilitated.

PRO

An open attendance policy fosters an atmosphere of mutual trust, understanding, and creativity.

The policy alleviates discipline problems arising from a revulsion to forced attendance and develops positive attitudes.

The policy produces a positive learning experience and reinforces responses which are positive in nature - does not reinforce fear of penalty responses as a punitive policy does.

Policy allows for positive student criticism - students right to criticize is reinforced.

Better than arbitrary policy which has shown its failure to educate in any real humanistic sense.

Punitive policies create an aversion to punishment not pursuit of the genuine learning goals.

Allows growth without lifelong penalities.

Attendance is a poor criterion for assigning an achievement grade. There is no rational way to justify relating grades and attendance.

Students who get behind because of absence withdraw.

CON

Encourages an attitude that class attendance is not important to intellectual or social growth.

Takes away expectations without providing for a positive substitute.

Leads students to feel they may come to class whenever they please.

Encourages extended "vacations."

Doesn't have a life-long punitive effect (old policy).

Gives students leave to punish themselves.

Punishes students who are less capable.

Weak students are given a license to be absent.

PRO

Policy helps instructor to take closer look at objectives -- at methods.

Policy gives good indication of how well prepared instructor is, how enthusiastic instructor is, how well the instructor motivates.

Vital teaching is reinforced; dullness rejected.

Motivation cannot be forced.

The dull "text reader" teacher is discouraged and encourages new, experimental styles. When properly explained, the policy is not abused by students.

CON

Too much time wasted on repeating for those absent.

Increases work load.

Policy adversely affects faculty morale.

Will have far reaching effects on morale and academic climate.

Low attendance produces a traumatic effect on faculty member.

Is an insult to the dedicated professional.

Demoralizes the faculty.

Policy has done irreparable harm to the school.

Puts more responsibility on the teacher.

Faculty shouldn't cater to the whims of the student.

Cannot "serve" students who don't come.

Too many students and faculty abuse the system.

Some teachers circumvent the policy.

Building-block or developmental learning is severely hampered if a student is irregular in attendance.

Policy weakens classroom environment.

Policy reduces effectiveness of teaching.

Decreases continuity.

PRO

Little evidence or sound argument is ever given to support a mandatory or arbitrary attendance policy.

See no difference in drop or non-attendance rate.

Student attendance is not determined by the policy - under any policy those who want to come, will; those who don't, won't.

"In loco parentis" is not an appropriate stance for a college.

Reinforces the College as a College and not as 13th and 14th grades of a high school.

CON

There is some evidence that withdrawal rate is greater as a consequence of the policy.

Cutting has doubled in my classes.

No real advantage in the system.

Out of touch with goals and objectives of CCC.

Philosophically unsound.

Policy is diametrically opposed to the open door policy.

The policy causes insecurity in those teachers who cling to the past, the high school way of doing things.

A dangerous precedent.

Students owe it to the College and the taxpayer to attend.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Establish policy which allows individual instructor to set and maintain his own policy.

2. Continue policy but - restrict it to 200 level courses;
limit number of times course can be repeated at same tuition rate;
allow for the instructor to withdraw a student without penalty after 25% absence (with appeal available);
limit to sophomores and/or 2.0 QPA or better;
limit number of cuts in first semester;
use 20% absence without penalty;
use a two cuts per credit hour base;
modify it to be compulsory in courses in which participation plays a major role;
a middle ground is needed, a more structured policy;
establish divisional policies in lieu of college-wide policy.

3. A need for development of course objectives exists.
Student responsibility must be more clearly defined and accepted by all.
Faculty should work to improve instruction, develop new techniques, methods, to make course attractive and stimulating for students.
Need to provide positive substitutes for required attendance.
More personalized evaluation procedures are needed.
Need a penalty for make-up tests.
Mail statement of policy to students.
Need an immediate follow-up and referral system for those who may be endangering their success through absences.